

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 HERMAN TAMRAT,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 ERICK RHODES, et al.,  
11 Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-01323-PJH](#)

**ORDER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 64, 66, 74

12  
13 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, proceeds with a pro se civil rights complaint under 42  
14 U.S.C. § 1983. Presently pending are several miscellaneous motions including an  
15 amended motion to compel. The court previously denied plaintiff's original motion to  
16 compel without prejudice and informed plaintiff that:

17 Simply listing the discovery he seeks to compel is insufficient.  
18 He must describe which specific discovery requests he seeks  
19 to compel, why defendants' responses are insufficient and why  
20 he is entitled to the discovery. Before filing an amended motion  
21 to compel, plaintiff must also meet and confer with defendants to  
22 try to resolve their disagreements before seeking court  
23 intervention. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a); N.D. Cal. Local Rule  
24 37.

25 Docket No. 62 at 1.

26 Plaintiff has failed to follow the court's instructions. He again has listed the  
27 numbers of certain discovery requests and seeks the court to compel defendants to  
28 provide the discovery. While he includes letters sent from him to defendants and  
defendants' responses, plaintiff has still failed to argue why defendants' answers are  
insufficient and why he is entitled to the discovery. These letters are from July and  
August 2021 and predate several of the court's relevant rulings regarding plaintiff's

1 motions to compel. Plaintiff has also still failed to attempt to meet and confer with  
2 defendants since the court's last ruling regarding discovery. Moreover, the court has still  
3 reviewed plaintiff's requests and the discovery provided by defendants and finds that the  
4 motion to compel lacks merit. For all these reasons the motion to compel (Docket No.  
5 66) is **DENIED**.

6 Plaintiff's motions seeking to bar certain videos (Docket Nos. 64, 74) from being  
7 reviewed by the court are **DENIED**. The court will review the videos when ruling on the  
8 summary judgment motion and address any relevant evidentiary issues in that ruling.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: December 30, 2021

11 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

12 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
13 United States District Judge